

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

The Beaumont Practice (1-8577962965)

Inspection date: 16 November 2022

Date of data download: 16 November 2022

Overall rating: Good

We previously inspected the practice on 27-30 April 2021 and rated safe as inadequate; effective as requires improvement; well-led as requires improvement; caring as good and responsive as good. This gave the practice an overall rating of requires improvement.

At this inspection we saw confirming evidence that all previous concerns had been adequately addressed and as a result the practice has now been rated as good overall.

Safe

Rating: Good

At our inspection in April 2021 we rated safe as inadequate because there was unsafe and inadequate management and monitoring of patients prescribed high-risk medicines and drug safety alerts were not being appropriately actioned. At this inspection we have re-rated safe to good, because all previous concerns had been rectified and the practice put robust systems and processes in place for the safe prescribing of all medicines and actioning and dissemination of drug safety alerts.

Safety systems and processes

The practice had clear systems, practices and processes to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Y
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Y
There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes.	Y
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	Y
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	Y
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	Y

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
There were regular discussions between the practice and other health and social care professionals such as health visitors, school nurses, community midwives and social workers to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm.	Y

Recruitment systems	Y/N/Partial
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	Y
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current UK Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) guidance if relevant to role.	Y

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: 02.10.2022	Y
There was a fire procedure.	Y
Date of fire risk assessment: 19.01.2022 Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	Y

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had received effective training on infection prevention and control.	Y
Infection prevention and control audits were carried out. Date of last infection prevention and control audit:	Y
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Y
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Y

Risks to patients

There were adequate systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

	Y/N/Partial
There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods.	Y
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Y
The practice was equipped to respond to medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	Y

Receptionists were aware of actions to take if they encountered a deteriorating or acutely unwell patient and had been given guidance on identifying such patients.	Y
There were enough staff to provide appointments and prevent staff from working excessive hours	Y

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment.

	Y/N/Partial
Individual care records, including clinical data, were written and managed securely and in line with current guidance and relevant legislation. ¹	Y
There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes.	Y
There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.	Y
Referrals to specialist services were documented, contained the required information and there was a system to monitor delays in referrals.	Y
There was a documented approach to the management of test results and this was managed in a timely manner.	Y
There was appropriate clinical oversight of test results, including when reviewed by non-clinical staff.	Y

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

The practice had systems for the appropriate and safe use of medicines, including medicines optimization

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	England comparison
Number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/07/2021 to 30/06/2022) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.44	0.58	0.82	Significant Variation (positive)
The number of prescription items for co-amoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones as a percentage of the total number of prescription items for selected antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1 sub-set). (01/07/2021 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	9.0%	9.9%	8.5%	No statistical variation

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	England comparison
Average daily quantity per item for Nitrofurantoin 50 mg tablets and capsules, Nitrofurantoin 100 mg m/r capsules, Pivmecillinam 200 mg tablets and Trimethoprim 200 mg tablets prescribed for uncomplicated urinary tract infection (01/01/2022 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	13.12	5.72	5.31	Significant Variation (negative)
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/01/2022 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	88.0‰	60.4‰	128.0‰	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/07/2021 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	0.83	0.58	0.59	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/01/2022 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	8.8‰	5.9‰	6.8‰	No statistical variation
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>The practice's data showed it prescribed higher than average Nitrofurantoin to treat urinary tract infections. However, it was able to evidence their CCG and national guidelines advised Nitrofurantoin should be the first line of treatment against urinary tract infection, and for this reason the prescribing of Nitrofurantoin was high.</p>				

Note: ‰ means *per 1,000* and it is **not** a percentage.

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
The practice ensured medicines were stored safely and securely with access restricted to authorised staff.	Y
Blank prescriptions were kept securely, and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Y
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Y
The practice could demonstrate the prescribing competence of non-medical prescribers, and there was regular review of their prescribing practice supported by clinical supervision or peer review.	Y
There was a process for the safe handling of requests for repeat medicines and evidence of effective medicines reviews for patients on repeat medicines. ¹	Y
The practice had a process and clear audit trail for the management of information about changes to a patient's medicines including changes made by other services.	Y
There was a process for monitoring patients' health in relation to the use of medicines including high risk medicines (for example, warfarin, methotrexate and lithium) with appropriate monitoring and clinical review prior to prescribing. ²	Y

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored the prescribing of controlled drugs. (For example, investigation of unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Y
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England and Improvement Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	Y
If the practice had controlled drugs on the premises there were appropriate systems and written procedures for the safe ordering, receipt, storage, administration, balance checks and disposal of these medicines, which were in line with national guidance.	Y
The practice had taken steps to ensure appropriate antimicrobial use to optimise patient outcomes and reduce the risk of adverse events and antimicrobial resistance.	Y
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	Y
The practice held appropriate emergency medicines, risk assessments were in place to determine the range of medicines held, and a system was in place to monitor stock levels and expiry dates.	Y
There was medical oxygen and a defibrillator on site and systems to ensure these were regularly checked and fit for use.	Y
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with UKHSA guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence, including from clinical searches.</p> <p>At the April 2021 inspection, we found concerns with the monitoring and prescribing of high-risk medicines, in particular Methotrexate, Leflunomide, Lithium, Azathioprine and Spironolactone. At this inspection we saw confirming evidence all patients previously identified at risk had been recalled and reviewed to ensure safe prescribing. At this inspection, we reviewed an additional 50 patients who were prescribed high-risk medicines and found no concerns with their prescribing. The practice had also put in place a new high-risk medicines policy. This policy outlined how to safely prescribe high-risk medicines and also stated the practice must conduct monthly audits of all patients prescribed high-risk medicines. We saw confirming evidence that the monthly audits were being carried out.</p>	

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

Significant events	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a variety of sources.	Y
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Y
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Y
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Y
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Y
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	13
Number of events that required action:	13

Example(s) of significant events recorded and actions by the practice.

Event	Specific action taken
Leaking roof in the nurse's room.	The landlord was informed and they fixed the leak. All medical equipment and medicines which were contaminated by the water had been discarded. A deep clean of the room had taken place.
Patient collapsed outside of surgery.	Medical staff were called and immediately attended to the patient. An ambulance was also called. A staff de-briefing took place and everyone was reminded of how to deal with emergency situations.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts. ¹	Y
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Y
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>At our previous inspection we reviewed the following two drug safety alerts and at that time we were not satisfied they had been appropriately actioned:</p> <p><u>Sodium Valproate (Epilim, Depakote and other generic brands) and carbimazole</u></p> <p>These medicines are associated with a significant risk of birth defects and developmental disorders in children born to women who take the drugs during pregnancy. At the April 2021 inspection we found this safety alert had not been reviewed, disseminated or actioned by the practice. At this inspection we re-reviewed this drug safety alert and saw confirming evidence all patients affected by this alert had a consultation and review with the lead GP discussing the risks.</p> <p><u>Simvastatin and Amlodipine.</u></p> <p>A drug alert was issued in December 2014 which outlined the increased risk of myopathy (clinical disorder of the skeletal muscles) when taking Simvastatin 40mg with amlodipine. At the April 2021 inspection we found this safety alert had not been reviewed, disseminated or actioned by the practice. At this inspection we re-reviewed this drug safety alert and saw confirming evidence all patients affected by this alert had a consultation and review with the lead GP.</p> <p>The practice had also put in place a new drug safety alert policy, it clearly outlined the steps the practice would take to ensure drug safety alerts were being recorded and actioned. We saw the practice now kept a log of all safety alerts which evidenced all relevant safety alerts had been disseminated to staff and actioned appropriately.</p>	

Effective

Rating: Good

At the previous inspection April 2021 we rated effective as requires improvement because we were not assured patients prescribed high-risk medicines for long-term conditions and mental health conditions were being managed and monitored appropriately. The uptake for cervical screening and immunisations was also below the national targets. At this inspection we saw adequate improvement and were now satisfied the previous concerns had been appropriately addressed. As a result, we have re-rated effective from requires improvement to good.

QOF requirements were modified by NHS England and Improvement for 2020/21 to recognise the need to reprioritise aspects of care which were not directly related to COVID-19. This meant that QOF payments were calculated differently. For inspections carried out from 1 October 2021, our reports will not include QOF indicators. In determining judgements in relation to effective care, we have considered other evidence as set out below.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment was delivered in line with current legislation, standards and evidence-based guidance supported by clear pathways and tools.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had systems and processes to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice.	Y
Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing. ¹	Y
Patients presenting with symptoms which could indicate serious illness were followed up in a timely and appropriate way. ²	Y
We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.	Y
Patients' treatment was regularly reviewed and updated. ³	Y
There were appropriate referral pathways to make sure that patients' needs were addressed.	Y
Patients were told when they needed to seek further help and what to do if their condition deteriorated.	Y
The practice prioritised care for their most clinically vulnerable patients.	Y

Effective care for the practice population

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The practice used a clinical tool to identify older patients who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs.Health checks, including frailty assessments, were offered to patients over 75 years of age.

- Flu, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.
- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40 to 74. There was appropriate and timely follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.
- All patients with a learning disability were offered an annual health check.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.
- The practice demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances.
- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder
- Patients with poor mental health, including dementia, were referred to appropriate services.

Management of people with long term conditions

Findings

- At the April 2021 inspection we were not assured patients prescribed high-risk medicines for long-term conditions and mental health conditions had received all necessary blood tests within appropriate timescales prior to prescribing as per national guidelines. We were also not assured clinicians had assessed the blood test results and satisfied themselves it was safe to prescribe. As result of our previous findings the practice had put in place robust policies and procedures which ensured appropriate monitoring, managing and prescribing of patients with long-term conditions were taking place. We reviewed the 10 records for patients with long-term conditions and we were satisfied they were being managed safely.
- Patients with long-term conditions were offered an effective annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long-term conditions had received specific training.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when deciding care delivery for patients with long-term conditions.
- The practice could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.
- Patients with asthma were offered an asthma management plan.

Child Immunisation	Numerator	Denominator	Practice %	Comparison to WHO target of 95%
The percentage of children aged 1 who have completed a primary course of immunisation for Diphtheria, Tetanus, Polio, Pertussis, Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib), Hepatitis B (Hep B) ((i.e. three doses of DTaP/IPV/Hib/HepB) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	26	31	83.9%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	30	36	83.3%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their immunisation for Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) and Meningitis C (MenC) (i.e. received Hib/MenC booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	30	36	83.3%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	31	36	86.1%	Below 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 5 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (two doses of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	28	39	71.8%	Below 80% uptake

Note: Please refer to the CQC guidance on Childhood Immunisation data for more information: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Any additional evidence or comments
<p>The practice had not met the World Health Organisation based national target of 95% (the recommended standard for achieving herd immunity) for five of five childhood immunisation uptake indicators. However, the uptake had improved since our last inspection, particularly for children aged 2. The practice also provided confirming evidence which showed patients who had not been vaccinated had been contacted numerous times, but the parents of these children did not wish for them to be vaccinated due to cultural reasons. We were satisfied the practice had an appropriate re-call system in place which included three attempts to contact patients and sending advice and educational leaflets on the importance of immunisations. We also saw evidence the lead GP contacted parents to educate and advise them to attend with their children.</p>

Cancer Indicators	Practice	SICBL average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of persons eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for persons aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for persons aged 50 to 64). (Snapshot date: 30/06/2022) (UK Health and Security Agency)	61.5%	N/A	80% Target	Below 70% uptake
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	41.6%	47.4%	61.3%	N/A
Persons, 60-74, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	54.5%	57.2%	66.8%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	55.6%	54.7%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Any additional evidence or comments
The practice had not met the 80% national uptake target for cervical screening. The practice informed us it had experienced cultural barriers with some population groups who expressed reluctance to engage with the cervical screening programme. To increase the uptake of cervical screening the practice participated in the YouScreen study, offering HPV self-sampling to non-attenders within the NHS Cervical Screening Programme (NHS CSP). Self-sampling is when women collect their own sample for cervical screening using a vaginal swab or brush. Self-samples are analysed for the presence of the human papillomavirus (HPV). We were satisfied the practice had an appropriate re-call system in place which included three attempts to contact patients and sending advice and educational leaflets on the importance of cervical screening. We also saw evidence the lead GP contacted parents to educate and advise them to attend with their children.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians took part in national and local quality improvement initiatives.	Y
The practice had a programme of targeted quality improvement and used information about care and treatment to make improvements.	Y
The practice regularly reviewed unplanned admissions and readmissions and took appropriate action.	Y

Example of improvements demonstrated because of clinical audits or other improvement activity in past two years

<u>Vitamin b12</u>
The practice had carried out a clinical audit to change the type of vitamin b12 injection from one brand to another, this was because the second brand was more effective and required fewer injections for the patient. In the first audit eleven patients were identified who required the change of injection. The practice called the patients in for consultations to see if they were willing to change to the new type of injection. In the second, audit it was identified eight out of the eleven patients had successfully changed over to the new type of injection.

Effective staffing

The practice was able demonstrate that staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to deliver effective care, support and treatment.	Y
The practice had a programme of learning and development.	Y
Staff had protected time for learning and development.	Y
There was an induction programme for new staff.	Y
Staff had access to regular appraisals, one to ones, coaching and mentoring, clinical supervision and revalidation. They were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation.	Y
The practice could demonstrate how they assured the competence of staff employed in advanced clinical practice, for example, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists and physician associates.	Y
There was a clear and appropriate approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.	Y

Coordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other organisations to deliver effective care and treatment.

Indicator	Y/N/Partial
Care was delivered and reviewed in a coordinated way when different teams, services or organisations were involved.	Y
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services.	Y

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in helping patients to live healthier lives.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice identified patients who may need extra support and directed them to relevant services. This included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients at risk of developing a long-term condition and carers.	Y
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Y
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Y
Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.	Y
The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.	Y

Consent to care and treatment

The practice always obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making. We saw that consent was documented.	Y
Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.	Y
Do Not Attempt Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (DNACPR) decisions were made in line with relevant legislation and were appropriate. ¹	Y

Well-led

Rating: Good

Leadership capacity and capability

There was compassionate, inclusive and effective leadership at all levels.

	Y/N/Partial
Leaders demonstrated that they understood the challenges to quality and sustainability.	Y
They had identified the actions necessary to address these challenges.	Y
Staff reported that leaders were visible and approachable.	Y
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Y

Vision and strategy

The practice had a clear vision and credible strategy to provide high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
The vision, values and strategy were developed in collaboration with staff, patients and external partners.	Y
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Y
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Y

Culture

The practice had a culture which drove high quality sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
There were arrangements to deal with any behaviour inconsistent with the vision and values.	Y
Staff reported that they felt able to raise concerns without fear of retribution.	Y
There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of staff.	Y
There were systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.	Y
When people were affected by things that went wrong, they were given an apology and informed of any resulting action.	Y
The practice encouraged candour, openness and honesty.	Y
The practice had access to a Freedom to Speak Up Guardian.	Y
Staff had undertaken equality and diversity training.	Y

Examples of feedback from staff or other evidence about working at the practice

Source	Feedback
Staff Interviews	We spoke with several members of staff during the inspection. All stated they felt well supported and that they had access to the equipment, tools and training necessary to enable them to perform their roles well. We were told staff were given protected time to enable them to undertake training and carry out non-clinical duties. Staff reported there were good, effective working relationships between managers and staff and clinical and non-clinical staff. Staff told us if they had any concerns they would raise them with management, with the confidence their concerns would be taken seriously and acted upon.

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

	Y/N/Partial
There were governance structures and systems which were regularly reviewed.	Y
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Y
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Y
There are recovery plans in place to manage backlogs of activity and delays to treatment.	Y
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
At our previous inspection we found the practice did not have adequate governance arrangements or appropriate systems and policies in place to ensure the safe management of patients prescribed high-risk medicines, or the dissemination and actioning of drug safety alerts. As explained above these issues have been adequately addressed and we saw confirming evidence of new policies and procedures in place, including monthly audits to ensure safe prescribing was taking place.	

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Y
There were processes to manage performance.	Y
There was a quality improvement programme in place.	Y
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Y
A major incident plan was in place.	Y

Staff were trained in preparation for major incidents.	Y
When considering service developments or changes, the impact on quality and sustainability was assessed.	Y

Appropriate and accurate information

There was a demonstrated commitment to using data and information proactively to drive and support decision making.

	Y/N/Partial
Staff used data to monitor and improve performance.	Y
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Y
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entailed.	Y

Governance and oversight of remote services

	Y/N/Partial
The practice used digital services securely and effectively and conformed to relevant digital and information security standards.	Y
The provider was registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Y
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Y
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	Y
The practice ensured patients were informed how their records were stored and managed.	Y
Patients were made aware of the information sharing protocol before online services were delivered.	Y
The practice had arrangements to make staff and patients aware of privacy settings on video and voice call services.	Y
Online consultations took place in appropriate environments to ensure confidentiality.	Y
The practice advised patients on how to protect their online information.	Y
Staff are supported to work remotely where applicable.	Y

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice involved the public, staff and external partners to sustain high quality and sustainable care.

	Y/N/Partial
Patient views were acted on to improve services and culture.	Y

The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	Partial
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	Y
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Y

Feedback from Patient Participation Group.

Feedback

The practice explained although there was a Patient Participation Group (PPG) in place, it was not currently active. This was because many of the members were vulnerable and reluctant to attend meetings. The practice was able to demonstrate its efforts to try and re-start the PPG and recruit new members but unfortunately no one had come forward. In place of the PPG, the practice manager holds three-monthly open meetings for patients to come forward and provide feedback.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were evidence of systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Y
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Y

Examples of continuous learning and improvement

The practice responded to our concerns of the April 2021 inspection. It now has robust systems and processes in place to ensure the safe prescribing of high-risk medicines and the dissemination and actioning of drug safety alerts.

Notes: CQC GP Insight

GP Insight assesses a practice's data against all the other practices in England. We assess relative performance for the majority of indicators using a "z-score" (this tells us the number of standard deviations from the mean the data point is), giving us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the England average. We highlight practices which significantly vary from the England average (in either a positive or negative direction). We consider that z-scores which are higher than +2 or lower than -2 are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry. Using this technique, we can be 95% confident that the practices performance is genuinely different from the average. It is important to note that a number of factors can affect the Z score for a practice, for example a small denominator or the distribution of the data. This means that there will be cases where a practice's data looks quite different to the average, but still shows as no statistical variation, as we do not have enough confidence that the difference is genuine. There may also be cases where a practice's data looks similar across two indicators, but they are in different variation bands.

The percentage of practices which show variation depends on the distribution of the data for each indicator but is typically around 10-15% of practices. The practices which are not showing significant statistical variation are labelled as no statistical variation to other practices.

N.B. Not all indicators in the evidence table are part of the GP insight set and those that aren't will not have a variation band.

The following language is used for showing variation:

Variation Bands	Z-score threshold
Significant variation (positive)	≤ -3
Variation (positive)	> -3 and ≤ -2
Tending towards variation (positive)	> -2 and ≤ -1.5
No statistical variation	< 1.5 and > 1.5
Tending towards variation (negative)	≥ 1.5 and < 2

Variation (negative)	≥ 2 and < 3
Significant variation (negative)	≥ 3

Note: for the following indicators the variation bands are different:

- Child Immunisation indicators. These are scored against the World Health Organisation target of 95% rather than the England average. Note that practices that have “Met 90% minimum” have not met the WHO target of 95%.
- The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to how easy it was to get through to someone at their GP practice on the phone uses a rules-based approach for scoring, due to the distribution of the data. This indicator does not have a SICBL average.
- The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). This indicator does not have a SICBL average and is scored against the national target of 80%.

It is important to note that z-scores are not a judgement in themselves, but will prompt further enquiry, as part of our ongoing monitoring of GP practices.

Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions on GP Insight can be found on the following link: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Note: The CQC GP Evidence Table uses the most recent validated and publicly available data. In some cases at the time of inspection this data may be relatively old. If during the inspection the practice has provided any more recent data, this can be considered by the inspector. However, it should be noted that any data provided by the practice will be unvalidated and is not directly comparable to the published data. This has been taken into account during the inspection process.

Glossary of terms used in the data.

- **COPD:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
- **UKHSA:** UK Health and Security Agency.
- **QOF:** Quality and Outcomes Framework.
- **STAR-PU:** Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex weightings Related Prescribing Units. These weighting allow more accurate and meaningful comparisons within a specific therapeutic group by taking into account the types of people who will be receiving that treatment.
- $\%$ = per thousand.